

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 11, 13, 14 and 16 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Hence, claims 1 – 20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Reissue Patent RE38,598, herein *Frese*.

### REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 9, 11 and 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1, 9, 11 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Frese*. However, *Frese* fails to disclose or suggest in any way various features of Claims 1, 9, 11 and 19.

Claims 1 and 11 require installing a plurality of components hosted in a first hosted environment to a second hosted environment, “in a manner that allows said second party to execute said plurality of components over said network.” Apparently, the Office Action has correlated the installing of the plurality of components of Claims 1, 9, 11 and 19 with the alleged installing of the RDM interface of *Frese*. Assuming the RDM is installed, *Frese* teaches that this interface is sent to the requesting party’s local computer, where, importantly, the interface is locally executed and controlled by the party. On the other hand, in Claims 1, 9, 11, and 19, the plurality of components is installed in a hosted environment, where the second party executes the components over a network.

Claims 9 and 19 require installing a plurality of components “in a manner that allows said party to execute said plurality of components over said network.” For reasons similar to those discussed with respect to Claims 1 and 11, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest in any way installing the RDM in a manner that would allow a party to execute it “over said network.”

Since *Frese* fails to disclose or suggest in any way these aspects of Claims 1, 9, 11 and 19, these claims are patentable. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

#### REMAINING PENDING CLAIMS

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependant claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependant claims includes the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependant claims and allowance of the dependant claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.


For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: August 10, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marcel K. Bingham  
Reg. No. 42,327


2055 Gateway Place  
San Jose, CA 95110-1089  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext.206  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on August 10, 2005

by

  
Jennifer Newell